

1 DAVID T. BIDERMAN, Bar No. 101577
2 TIMOTHY J. FRANKS, Bar No. 197645
3 M. CHRISTOPHER JHANG, Bar No. 211463
4 FARSHAD FARZAN, Bar No. 215194
5 **PERKINS COIE LLP**
6 Four Embarcadero Center, Suite 2400
7 San Francisco, California 94111
8 Telephone: (415) 344-7000
9 Facsimile: (415) 344-7050
10 Email: DBiderman@perkinscoie.com
11 Email: TFranks@perkinscoie.com
12 Email: CJhang@perkinscoie.com
13 Email: FFarzan@perkinscoie.com
14 Attorneys for Defendant GOOGLE INC.

15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
SAN JOSE DIVISION

10 CLRB HANSON INDUSTRIES, LLC d/b/a
11 INDUSTRIAL PRINTING, and HOWARD
12 STERN, on behalf of themselves and all others
13 similarly situated,

14 Plaintiffs,

15 v.

16 GOOGLE INC.,

17 Defendant.

18 CASE NO. C 05-03649 JW

19 [PROPOSED] ORDER GRANTING
20 PLAINTIFFS' ADMINISTRATIVE
21 MOTION UNDER LOCAL RULE 79-5(d)
22 FOR LEAVE TO FILE UNDER SEAL
23 PORTIONS OF DOCUMENTS DUE TO
24 CONFIDENTIAL DESIGNATIONS BY
25 DEFENDANT GOOGLE, INC.

26 Date: January 6, 2009
27 Time: 10:00 a.m.
28 Place: Courtroom 5
Judge: Honorable Patricia V. Trumbull

1 Plaintiffs' Administrative Motion Under Local Rule 79-5(d) for Leave to File Under Seal
2 Portions of Documents Due to Confidential Designations by Defendant Google, Inc. (the
3 "Motion") was filed on November 26, 2008. Upon consideration of the Motion and the
4 Declaration of David T. Biderman filed in support thereof, the Court finds there is good cause to
5 grant the request to file the following document and information under seal:

6 **Plaintiffs' Motion to Compel Google, Inc.'s Answer to Interrogatories No. 4
7 and 5 and to Produce Documents in Response to Request for Production No.
29, and**

8 **Exhibit 6 to the Declaration of Rachel S. Black in Support of Plaintiffs'
9 Motion to Compel Google, Inc.'s Answer to Interrogatories No. 4 and 5 and
10 to Produce Documents in Response to Request for Production No. 29.**

11 GOOD CAUSE having been shown, the Court finds that:

12 (1) The parties possess overriding confidentiality interests that overcome the right of
13 public access to the record in the above-mentioned documents;

14 (2) The parties' overriding confidentiality interests support sealing the record;

15 (3) A substantial probability exists that the parties' overriding confidentiality interests
16 will be prejudiced if the record is not sealed;

17 (4) The proposed sealing is narrowly tailored; and

18 (5) No less restrictive means exist to achieve this overriding interest.

19 IT IS THEREFORE ORDERED that Plaintiffs' Motion is GRANTED.

20 IT IS SO ORDERED.

21
22 DATED: _____

23 The Honorable Patricia V. Trumbull
24 United States Magistrate Judge
25
26
27
28